

should leverage these "leap ahead technologies" which promise a warfighting edge well into the next century. We should minimize expenditures on procuring evolutionary technologies and maintaining old systems that do not promise a significant edge on tomorrow's battlefield.

Funding Operations at the Expense of Readiness. We are already deep in the process of using readiness funds to pay for peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. In theory, much of this expenditure will be repaid through supplemental appropriations or out of Department of Defense contingency funds. In practice, it is very unlikely that the services will ever be fully repaid for the cost of their operations, and they will be forced to pay for peacekeeping and humanitarian actions in a way that will affect their readiness. In Bosnia, the Army's actual reimbursement is about 90 cents on the dollar.

Spending Savings Before We Achieve Them. It is very easy to achieve management efficiencies on paper, and to cut infrastructure or reduce support funding to achieve budget savings. In practice, however, there is an increasing tendency to cut first and determine the practicality of such savings later. On February 10, 1998, General Reimer testified to the Senate Armed Services Committee that

We have programmed \$10.5 billion worth of efficiencies across the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP). These efficiencies are based upon better business practices and reform initiatives . . . these are risks associated with this budget.

REPEATING THE 1970S, THE ROAD TO GOING
HOLLOW AGAIN

Whatever we do, let us not repeat the mistakes of the 1970s. In the Post-Vietnam era, much of the decline in active duty force levels through the 1970s was the result of decisions made by the individual services to funnel resources into badly needed modernization programs. To at least some extent, however, the numbers also reflected the difficulty the services were having attracting and retaining quality recruits. A number of factors combined to complicate the challenge of manning the all-volunteer force. First, military pay generally lagged well behind pay in the private sector. Second, the end of the Vietnam War saw cuts in many personnel benefits, including the education benefits of the Montgomery GI Bill.

In the post-Vietnam era, I remember all too well, from first-hand experience, U.S. Navy ships that could not get underway for lack of manning and from serious maintenance shortfalls. I remember too many aircraft—we called them hangar queens—parked in the hangar bay, never to fly during a deployment for lack of spare parts, sacrificed so that other jets could launch from the decks of the carrier.

As a matter of national security, we must solemnly commit that the dangerous decline in military readiness that followed the conclusion of the Vietnam War will not be repeated as

we continue to draw down our Cold War-era forces. Credible warnings that we are approaching the "hollow force" levels of the 1970s can no longer be ignored. Let us act now to avoid this calamity.

Acting responsibly requires an awareness of the ways in which forces can go hollow. Simply attempting to avoid the mistakes of the 1970s will not necessarily protect us as the United States prepares to enter the new millennium as the preeminent political, economic, and military power in the world.

My Naval Academy classmate and former roommate in flight school, Admiral Chuck Larson, had this to say about readiness when he was the Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific (USCINCPAC) in 1993:

When the system of readiness begins to crumble, the decay will normally start from the inside out to the cutting edge. We should be on guard when it becomes necessary to increase operational tempo requirements to meet routine commitments; funds must be transferred among accounts to support increased OPTEMPO, unforeseen operations, or contingencies; and, we are compelled to decrease, cancel or defer planned maintenance, training or logistics support activities and functions.

Mr. President, in 1777, Thomas Paine said, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it." Yesterday, the Joint Chiefs made clear that this Administration has not adequately supported our armed forces. We must labor to provide this support or face the dire consequences of inaction. The blessings of freedom may ultimately hang in the balance.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I thought it was important—and maybe even a similar event yesterday—the testimony of the Service Chiefs before the Senate Armed Services Committee; their candor and frank assessment of the challenges that we face were more than welcome. I and others expressed our disappointment that this candor was so long in coming. But we should applaud the fact that it was there.

Mr. President, I picked up the Washington Post this morning and saw that there is evidence that Iraq is now developing a nuclear weapon.

In Kosovo, there are horrible pictures on the front page of the New York Times of the ethnic cleansing and barbaric, terrible, murderous behavior of the Serbs that is going on there. Two weeks ago, we learned that the North Koreans had launched a three-stage nuclear capable missile, and this administration seems to believe that bribing them to somehow modify their behavior is the way to go when clearly there are indications that their acts have become more bellicose. Their efforts to acquire nuclear capable weapons and the testing of missiles indicate that that policy has failed.

I could go to other places in the world of potential flashpoints which may entail the expenditure of American blood and treasure. I am very con-

cerned, Mr. President, about our ability to meet those potential challenges. I am more concerned after the testimony of the Joint Chiefs yesterday. I strongly argue for a change, I mean a very significant change—that the administration sit down with the Congress of the United States, the people's representatives, and try together to chart out a way we can rectify these wrongs that have taken place over the last 6 years. We must act together in a bipartisan fashion. If the administration continues to ignore the Congress, we will have to act ourselves, which is not always in the benefit of the Nation. However, we as Members of Congress have to readjust our priorities concerning base closings and most efficient use of depots, including unneeded and unwanted military construction projects and many other parochial projects, so that we can divert all of these scarce resources to protecting our national security.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes under the control of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to commend my friend and distinguished colleague from Arizona for his comments. He is on target. I wish to associate myself with those comments and pick up where Senator McCain left off, addressing some of the same issues but from a different perspective, although it is part of the total perspective, and that is foreign policy.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, foreign policy to Nebraskans and many Americans is not theory or some abstraction suspended between university classrooms, State Department corridors, or congressional hearing rooms. Foreign policy is the framework policy for America's interests in the world—trade and commerce, national security, financial markets, international economics, coalitions and alliances, narcotics policy, technology, immigration, all part of foreign policy. Foreign policy is America's future. It represents the complete and integrated policy that affects every dynamic of American life. Foreign policy connects all other policies. The world is interconnected. And the one overarching policy process America has to engage the world is foreign policy.

President Kennedy spoke of new frontiers in his 1961 inaugural address. He spoke of the long-term challenges in the long twilight struggle against communism. Today, just as in 1961, and throughout history, mankind has been presented with new sets of challenges and new frontiers. These new challenges dominate after every global transformation. President Bush's new book deals directly with our present-day world transformation—"A World Transformed"—and we recall President

Kennedy's words in that inaugural speech and apply them to the challenges of the 21st century.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Today, as in 1961, America stands again at a crossroads, at a unique but not unprecedented time in history. We have witnessed other great global shifts at several points in the 20th century. In the early days of Teddy Roosevelt, we saw America emerge as a global power. After World War I, America retreated into a mindless isolationism as economic depression and tyranny spread throughout the world. In 1941, World War II again thrust America into a leading role in the world and made us again a dominant power. The rise of the Soviet Union ushered in the cold war with its deadly arms race, nuclear brinkmanship, and policies of containment enforced by American soldiers.

For over 40 years, the world was divided between two powerful enemies capable of destroying each other and the world. During this period, hope, opportunity, and freedom were held captive in many nations to authoritarian rule. Hundreds of millions of people across the globe were victims of political slavery. And then in 1989 the Soviet empire crumbled as freedom broke through the Iron Curtain.

In the decade of the 20th century, we have seen great changes as the world settles out from the cold war. We stand at the edge of a great precipice. The world is changing around us, under us, above us. The rate of change is phenomenal, almost incalculable, for both good and evil. This change unnerves us, it challenges us, and will dominate us unless we shape the change and lead the force of change for good in the world.

History provides valuable lessons, but it holds no clear blueprint or roadmap for the future. The rise of technology and communications has connected the world in every way. Our economies are intertwined. Our economies are interconnected. Today we live in a global community anchored by global economies.

We also face new threats. Unlike the past, these threats do not come from a single country or a single enemy or a single state; they are borderless threats. The scourge of terrorism brings with it the deadly threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The trafficking of illegal drugs respects neither boundaries nor borders nor governments. The confluence of economic and national security concerns has created mutual threats and mutual self-interests among all nations of the world.

What do we do? Where does the United States go from here? After great global shifts, there is always a time of uncertainty and instability. There is no clearly lit path to follow. Different times call for new solutions to new challenges, borderless challenges.

One thing is clear, Mr. President. The United States of America must lead

the world in the 21st century. We are the only dominant power in the world today, which provides us with immense opportunity but yet awesome responsibility. America must lead. America must not be intimidated by the unprecedented rate of change and uncertainty in the world. The diffusion of new geopolitical, economic, and military power that will develop over the next few years will form the world's power structure well into the next century. Of this we can be certain: America must engage this natural development, welcome it, and lead it.

Timidity is not America's heritage. Boldness inspires. As George Bush said, as he accepted the Republican nomination for President in 1988,

One issue overwhelms all others and that's the issue of peace. . . . One by one the unfree places fall, not to the force of arms but to the force of an idea: freedom works. . . . It's a watershed. It is no accident. It happened when we acted on the ancient knowledge that strength and clarity [strength and clarity] lead to peace; weakness and ambivalence lead to war.

FACING THE CHALLENGES OF THE 21ST CENTURY

America's objectives in this new century must be to help build security, hope, and opportunity. The United States and all nations will prosper in the 21st century if we lead a world of more freedom, stronger democracies, and unlimited trade and investment. Such a world is in our national interests. It is in the mutual self-interests of all peoples.

The next 2 years are especially critical.

They will help set precedents for much of the early part of the 21st century. Events will occur in the next 2 years that will change the shape of the world.

THE FUTURE OF AMERICA IN THE NEXT 2 YEARS AND BEYOND 2000

The future of America into the next century will be dominated by foreign policy. Because of our interconnected world, foreign policy is no longer just the practice of statecraft.

The completeness of foreign policy will include a strong national defense first, and Senator MCCAIN was very clear in his statement on that point. Second, the completeness of foreign policy will include a strong economy. And third, foreign policy will include clear, concise, comprehensive international policies—trade policies—all wrapped into a foreign policy.

The two essential parts of a successful foreign policy in the 21st century will be, one, building consensus, building consensus both in the United States with the American people and internationally by working with coalitions of willing partners; and, two, projecting strong U.S. leadership in the world.

BUILDING CONSENSUS THROUGH ALLIANCES, INSTITUTIONS AND COALITIONS

In the next century, the United States must work to build international consensus through coalitions, alliances and institutions. The diffu-

sion of power throughout the world will result in regional spheres of influence. In this structure and the challenges it presents, no one nation, no matter how powerful, can singlehandedly control the outcome.

Borderless challenges will require borderless solutions. The United States will be most effective when we work with our allies and those willing to work with us. That does not mean weakening or compromising our national sovereignty. But we will be successful when we work with others to achieve our mutual goals. The coalition assembled by President Bush to drive Iraq from Kuwait was a good example of what we can accomplish when working in concert with those who share our aims—all with mutual self-interests.

As we approach the 21st century, America must evaluate its current partnerships and build new ones. We first need to review our current global commitments, alliances, coalitions and institutions. Many of these entities were created to address the challenges of a world that no longer exists.

The nations that assembled at Bretton Woods in 1944 and created the IMF and World Bank faced a dramatically different economic system than we currently find today. The current debate that rages on and on and on over IMF funding and IMF reform is a timely example of this point.

I agree, as does the IMF, that it needs reform, but what kind of reform? Not the reform of glancing blows and cheap political rhetoric and demagogic rhetoric for partisan gain. Today, we are struggling to define our world's financial and economic infrastructure and center of gravity, even while we swirl and swirl in its sea of changes. What should be the role of the G-7? Should it be revitalized? Is the G-7 still relevant, especially since the introduction of the European Monetary Union?

The United Nations was formed during the beginning of the cold war and has gone far beyond its original charter and objectives. What should be the role of the United Nations in the next century? How do we continue to fund it and at what amount? Is the United Nations overburdened with too many assignments and expectations? What about missile defense for the United States of America? Is the 1972 ABM Treaty with a nation once described by President Reagan as being "relegated to the dustbin of history" still relevant? Does this treaty protect America from rogue nations with weapons of mass destruction? I don't think so.

We need a debate on this issue. We need to take a clear-eyed, insightful and penetrating look at these institutions and relationships. We need to ask tough questions: Are they relevant to the challenges of the 21st century? Are their objectives still meaningful? Can they adapt to address new challenges?

If we cannot answer these questions, then we need to change these institutions or create new ones to meet our

current global economic and security challenges. One of the relevant new organizations for the 21st century is the World Trade Organization. Created to provide a structure for determining global trade practices and settling trade disputes, the WTO is a good example of an organization born to deal with the new challenges of the new century.

Regional alliances will play a greater role in a world unshackled from the restraints of the cold war. They will not be isolated blocs, but regions of mutual interest within an interconnected world. These coalitions will and do exist because of mutual economic and security interests and can play an important role in expanding security, growth and opportunity in the world. They can help build, encourage and support new democracies and market economies and ensure hope for all peoples.

These are critical building blocks for the 21st century. As Hugh Sidey once wrote:

Hope energizes . . . doubt destroys.

Hope is fundamental to the human condition. Without it, desperation takes hold. We know desperate men do desperate things. War, conflict and poverty are the enemies of all peoples. America must pull back the curtain of the status quo and take a long, thoughtful look at the needs, problems and cultures of developing countries. If we would have taken more care and invested more thought and time in Vietnam, we may not have blundered into that tragic mistake.

The building of new regional alliances will require finding common denominators of interests within a region. For example, the fate of the nations in the Caspian Sea region are linked to each other. No nation will prosper in that area of the world until they all prosper. Much of Europe has already determined that it is in their mutual self-interest to link their monetary and currency policies through the creation of a single currency, the Euro. The conflict in the Middle East will not be resolved until there is regional peace. Economic prosperity also awaits that peace.

Regional alliances left over from the cold war also need to be reviewed. We have done this to some extent with NATO when we added three new members. But we need to step back and take a closer look at NATO and at the role NATO should play in a new century. What will be NATO's purpose? How far should NATO expand? Should it expand? What are the consequences, costs and benefits of continued expansion of NATO? Any further expansion must be based on a clearly defined role for NATO.

In light of the current mass destruction and war in Kosovo of which Senator McCain spoke, and Bosnia before it, one must ask this question: Is NATO relevant since it is a European security organization? The slaughter in Kosovo goes on. Yet the world looks on while

NATO and the United Nations stand by issuing empty ultimatums to Milosevic.

One could legitimately ask, What is the mission of NATO in the United Nations? To stop the butchery in Kosovo? Or after a while stop it? Or talk about stopping it? Or what? How long will NATO troops stay in Bosnia, especially in light of the recent elections in Serbska where Mrs. Plavsic, the candidate of the west, was defeated by the nationalist, Mr. Poplasen?

We are going to need to build new coalitions to address today's borderless challenges. These need not be former alliances or new multilateral institutions. The United States needs to address today's challenges with those nations willing and able to join us. Again, America must lead.

Prime among those borderless challenges is navigating a global economy. The current world financial crisis is presenting the best minds around the globe with unparalleled challenges. In some ways, we face a situation similar to when Christopher Columbus set sail from the coast of Spain in the 15th century.

At that time, back onshore, the debate raged on whether the Earth was flat or round. The answers were unknown. Only by sailing the unpredictable seas and safely reaching the new world was Columbus able to deliver an answer. We are currently navigating the most turbulent of economic waters. This storm of financial instability has left many of the world's economies reeling. As of yet, the full brunt of this storm has not yet reached American shores, but it is out there, and we do not know what path it will take. Will it engulf Brazil and sweep up through the Americas? We do not know. We do know that America alone cannot stem this tide. We will only find a way to calm this storm by working with the other nations of the world and by rethinking and restructuring international organizations like the IMF and the World Bank.

Free, fair, open trade will be the engine of growth in the new century, as it has been for the last half of the 20th century. All nations must work to break down barriers that inhibit global commerce and trade. Only then will all the world prosper. We in the United States must do far more to educate our people and our leaders on this issue.

I have concluded, Mr. President—and you and I have worked on this issue for over 2 years—I have concluded that economic ignorance favoring the short term over the long term and concentrations of selfish political and economic power are the main reasons why free, fair and open trade is not universally supported in the United States or in this Congress.

We must also stand up against protectionists at home and abroad who would take the world back to the disastrous days of the 1930s. We must not underestimate this threat, especially in light of last week's defeat of fast

track in the House of Representatives. Economic isolation is impossible if for no other reason than the world Internet revolution.

Terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction pose the greatest dangers and threats to global security in the 21st century. No nation will be immune and no one nation can fight these enemies alone. The trafficking of illegal drugs also threatens security and hope around the world. Those engaging in these despicable acts must be made the pariahs of the civilized world, stopped at every turn and dealt with harshly. But we need coalitions built on mutual self-interest to deal with these scourges.

PROJECTING U.S. LEADERSHIP

While we must work with the other nations of the world, there can be no leadership by committee. We currently have a vacuum of leadership in the world. History has taught us that the world is most dangerous and unpredictable when there are vacuums of global leadership.

Leaders and nations lead through the force of confidence, character, honesty and trust. Our leadership must be based on credibility. The word of the United States should be the strongest of currencies in international relations. The nations of the world must trust our word and trust our commitment. We must remember the words of Teddy Roosevelt who once said, "The one indispensable requisite for both a nation and an individual is character." This gives America the moral authority to lead, not the religious authority, not the holy authority, but the moral authority to lead.

Our allies must respect us and our adversaries must fear us. Rhetoric without actions will result in failure and will encourage dictators and world instability. Today, again as Senator McCain mentioned minutes ago, Iraq and North Korea are directly and openly challenging the civilized world. The United States must have a clearly defined American foreign policy that is backed with the might of the U.S. military. Genuine leadership is more than crisis management. The ability to lead rests on others knowing where you stand.

The guarantor of a nation's foreign policy is its national defense. A nation's word is only as strong as the military and the will that stands behind it. The United States must make strengthening our military one of its most immediate top priorities. Without a strong military, our threats are hollow.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN SHAPING FOREIGN POLICY

The role of Congress in helping shape American foreign policy must be greater as we move into the 21st century. America cannot lead the world without the support of the American people. Foreign policy and everything it encompasses must be relevant—must be relevant—to the daily lives of the American people. Responsibility for

making foreign policy relevant ultimately rests with the President and his foreign policy team. However, the Congress must be part of the development of foreign policy—setting objectives and priorities, providing oversight and advice, allocating resources and helping set strategic direction. Congress should be a full partner with the President in foreign policy. The Congress cannot implement or execute foreign policy, nor should it try. That is the President's job.

Foreign policy should be bipartisan. America's leaders need to speak with one voice to the world. We may debate the best course in this Congress, in committee, as we should, but there is no room for partisan politics and partisan gain in doing what is right in this Nation in the international arena. The Truman-Vandenberg relationship is a good model.

Engaging the American people is just one aspect of a greater role for Congress in shaping foreign policy. To craft policies that will allow America to engage in and lead the world, Members of Congress will need to acknowledge and understand the completeness of foreign policy, the interconnects of foreign policy.

What can Congress do? Over the next 2 years I propose—and I will be proposing this to the bipartisan leadership of this Congress—that the 106th Congress, which will assemble in January of next year, start holding oversight hearings on every facet of America's foreign policy. Congress should encourage new ideas and new solutions from our best foreign policy thinkers during these hearings. The Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the International Relations Committee in the House should coordinate at these hearings, under the direction of the bipartisan leadership of Congress, and review every multilateral relationship the United States has, every institution, alliance and coalition, review the mission, the organization, the relevancy, the cost, the benefits.

In many instances, there should be joint hearings with committees, such as Armed Services and Foreign Relations, Banking and Foreign Relations, Finance and Foreign Relations, and other combinations of committees. The results of these hearings should be summarized and sent to the President and his foreign policy team, every Member of Congress, the President's Cabinet, and be made available to the American people. The results of these hearings will help formulate America's foreign policy for the next century.

In the next 2 years, Congress must develop a comprehensive trade policy and pass much-needed trade reform legislation. Our trade policy needs an overhaul to meet the challenges of a global economy, especially our sanctions policy.

Sanctions are a legitimate foreign policy tool but they are not a substitute for foreign policy. Unilateral sanctions do not work in an inter-

connected world. The imposition of sanctions fails to take into account the long-term consequences for America and ties the President's hands, giving him no flexibility to react to the unique international situations which may require delicate diplomacy, diplomatic maneuvering, or decisive, tough, strong action.

Approving fast-track authority should be part of this trade package. Congress should make maximum use of blue-ribbon commissions like the Rumsfeld Commission on missile defense and the Kassebaum-Baker Commission on gender-integrated training in our Armed Forces.

America wastes a tremendous amount of talent and experience when we do not use our former highly respected members of Government and Congress to help us solve our complicated and interconnected challenges and problems. This will all stimulate and frame a national debate on critically important issues that will help inform and educate America on the great challenges, the important, the vital challenges of our time. Foreign relations—and all that it encompasses—must not be held hostage to politics or partisan gain. It will not work any other way in this interconnected world of short-term and long-term danger.

CONCLUSION

When history records the world, and this time in the world, and the world's move from the 20th to the 21st century, will it show that America and the world squandered a most precious opportunity and unique time in the history of man? Will it record an era of "inter-cold war" after 40 years of cold war? A time of world anarchy and growing disorder? A period when the world, in fact, went backwards and allowed the progress of the last 50 years to erode? Will it lament opportunities not taken, and are thus forever lost?

The answers will be determined by the role the United States plays in the world during the next few years. We do have choices. But the choices we make first must be based on the values and the ideals of a just nation. Our foreign policy must be in our national interest—clearly defined, driven by priorities, objectives, and implemented with focused strategies. A random conduct of foreign policy will not do. The President and the Congress must forge a strong bipartisan partnership underpinned by a strong congressional bipartisan effort.

This Congress must use the next 2 years to help prepare America and the world for this new dynamic competitive center. America must be nimble in putting together a coalition of countries allied around the common interests of civilized people. We must be smart in how we multiply our power and interest around the world.

The United States must be careful not to overload multilateral institutions like the United Nations and the IMF. They are equipped to do only so

much. When their circuits are overloaded, they will fail, and fail dramatically, thus causing great uncertainty, leaving deep and wide vacuums of confidence in the world. The next 2 years are going to be difficult years for the United States. They may be dangerous years, as well. The President of the United States is wounded. He is, maybe, fatally wound. This will affect his international standing and leadership. This is of his own doing. America must pull together to present to the world a unified nation with respect to our global leadership responsibilities. We must do this so that we will continue to gain the confidence of the world that gives us the credibility to continue to lead the world. The Congress will be called upon for greater international leadership. It must be prepared for this role.

For all our flaws and imperfections, the world looks to America for leadership because the world trusts us because of our people. Americans are innately fair and decent people with a wonderful abundance of common sense. Our system of government allows the fairness and decency of the American culture to dominate all aspects of our way of life. It allows the best of our people and our culture to soar high. Yes, we are sometimes misguided, heavy-handed and even arrogant. But we have this intangible "self-correction" process built deep into our national psyche. We can and often do "self-correct"—both personally and nationally. Which the world sees, trusts, and admires.

It is within our grasp to help shape a world that has the potential to do more good for more people than man has ever known. This is an awesome responsibility but one that America is up to if America does what it always does best—work together. At the end, when the curtain comes down, and we are held accountable, all that really matters is what this century's greatest leader, Winston Churchill, once said:

What is the use of living, if it be not to strive for noble causes, and to make this muddled world a better place for those who will live in it after we are gone?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Under a previous order, there will now be 25 minutes under the control of the Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, first, I commend my good friend and colleague from Nebraska for providing the Senate and all of our colleagues and all who have listened, and I hope, the Nation's press and the international press, a comprehensive statement with regard to foreign policy. We have many Senators who certainly have expertise in this field, but I know of no one in the Senate who has given a more articulate overview of what America faces in our role to the world than Senator HAGEL.

Senator HAGEL and I have been extremely concerned about the trade policy of the United States, not only in regard to the administration, but in regard to this Congress. In Nebraska and Kansas, States we are privileged to represent, our livelihood, our very livelihood, depends on progressive, consistent trade policy. We both know and we both have talked for almost a year now about the Asian flu, the global contagion, and how that has impacted especially agriculture—our Kansas farmers and our Nebraska farmers—but everybody that depends on trade.

We have been very concerned about the lack of funding for IMF and normal trading status for China, fast-track legislation—which, I must say, the withdrawal of fast track and now the defeat of fast track in the House is a terrible blow; it is like shattered glass, if you will. It is like an embargo. I think we are going to pay enormous penalties for that. And then sanction reform, as the Senator mentioned. Until we get our act together, until we get a consistent and positive policy in regard to trade, I am afraid we will go through some very, very difficult times.

The Senator from Nebraska has seized the issue. He has given a very comprehensive view. I want to thank him for it. I hope that many pay attention. I look forward to working with the Senator in this regard.

KOSOVO

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a related issue. The Senator from Nebraska touched on foreign policy and how it affects our national security. I want to express my concern that President Clinton and the United States, in coordination with NATO, is once again preparing to take military action with very little, if any dialog, with the Congress or the American people.

Once again, the President of the United States may be about to "plant the flag" of U.S. credibility that will lock this Nation in another expensive, long involvement without any clear discussion—it may be warranted; it may be in the national interest, but without any clear discussion of U.S. vital national interest—and that involvement is in a place in the world called Kosovo.

The news today is pretty grim. The news from Kosovo has been and continues to be very grim. In the Washington Post, here is a story as of this morning:

"New Kosovo Massacre May Spur NATO To Act." This is not pretty. I am quoting from the Post story by Mr. Guy Dinmore:

Their bodies lay as they fell, throats cut or shot in the back of the head—19 ethnic Albanians believed to have been executed by Serbian police units in the most harrowing massacre of civilians since warfare erupted in Kosovo seven months ago.

Relatives and neighbors today dug graves for the dead—most of them women, children

and elderly people—as they tearfully recounted the massacre that occurred Saturday when government forces entered this village in the Serbian province of Kosovo following the killing of seven policemen by separatist guerrillas.

With the death toll in the bitter conflict between government forces and ethnic Albanian rebels steadily mounting and little sign that Serbia will adhere to a unilateral cease-fire senior NATO sources said today there is a growing possibility that the Western alliance will intervene militarily in Kosovo as early as next month.

Serbia is the dominant Republic of Yugoslavia, and NATO sources say the alliance's next step would be to deliver an ultimatum to Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic demanding a cease-fire and full access to refugees from the Kosovo conflict. If the demands are not met, they said, NATO would proceed with plans set in motion at a NATO defense ministers meeting last week to launch airstrikes against Serbian targets. Last week, the U.N. Security Council issued a call for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of government forces from Kosovo.

In the New York Times—and as Senator MCCAIN pointed out a few short moments ago, and completes the pictures—there is a very disturbing story summed up:

Senior officials in Washington and NATO last week stepped up their threats of military force against Milosevic and demanded that his forces stop their rampage.

A USA Today headline, "Yugoslavian Army Takes Steps to Avoid Strikes."

Up to 150 Yugoslavian army vehicles pulled out of southern Kosovo Tuesday in an apparent move to avoid NATO airstrikes, Yugoslavia media reported. But the Pentagon said it had seen no evidence of a large-scale pull back, and NATO stepped up its plans for military strikes to stop the Yugoslav onslaught.

Then in the London Times, a story by Tom Walker, the reporter who discovered the tragedy:

I discovered the bodies of 16 Albanian civilians [now it is up to 19] massacred by Serb forces in a remote village in Kosovo yesterday.

I won't go into the gory details.

The international press and our local national press are forecasting what I think everybody in the Senate certainly is aware of.

I commend to my colleagues the latest issue of Time Magazine. The headline reads, "The Balkan Mess: The West has been fiddling while Kosovo burns and regional peace strategies falter."

This is precisely the topic that Senator HAGEL was talking about. I don't like saying this, but the headline says it: "And Bill Clinton is too distracted to pay proper attention."

The highlights of the article are as follows:

But Kosovo is far and away the worst of the current crises. Vowing not to permit another slaughter like Bosnia's, the NATO allies threatened Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic last June with airstrikes unless he halted his security forces' attacks on the rebellious Albanians. Even if Clinton hadn't been bedeviled by scandal, the threat would have been difficult to carry out. France [in typical fashion] refused to go along with the

military action unless the U.N. Security Council approved, and Russia promised to veto any resolution that authorized it.

Washington was also stuck in internal wrangling. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright wanted the White House to push harder for NATO military action, but Defense Secretary William Cohen balked, fearing air strikes would only embolden the Kosovo Liberation Army, then at the peak of its strength and demanding an independent state, which Washington opposed. Clinton was too distracted to knock bureaucratic heads or force the allies to carry out their threat. The indecision "proved to be a disaster," said a U.S. diplomat. "Milosevic took the measure of the west and decided he could take advantage of it."

By last month, The Serb leader had turned his counteroffensive against the rebel army into a campaign of terror against Albanian villages. Suddenly, whole sections of the population were being driven from their homes, but the Western response remained inaudible. In part, critics charge that the U.S. tacitly let Milosevic go ahead because the West also wanted to break the back of the rebel army, whose lack of structure threatened regional stability.

That is a sad, sad commentary if in fact that is true.

So last week the Security Council finally passed a Franco-British resolution demanding that Milosevic halt his offensive and begin negotiations, or face the possibility of armed intervention. The attack plan calls for U.S. cruise missiles to be launched first . . .

I'll repeat that.

The attack plan calls for U.S. cruise missiles to be launched first against Serb military targets in Kosovo; then, if needed, NATO would mount a wider air campaign outside Kosovo against security facilities in Serbia.

Even if the Administration rouses itself to take charge of the Balkan situation—

Senator HAGEL tried to point this out, and Senator MCCAIN has tried to point this out, as others have—

damage to U.S. foreign policy may have already been done. Allies sense distraction and are growing worried, but are unable to step in. Enemies may see opportunities for making mischief.

That is certainly true, with the third-stage rocket being tested by North Korea, and Saddam Hussein is certainly not behaving. And India and Pakistan are continuing their war of words. There is very little justification, by the way, for the missile strike in regard to Sudan and the Khartoum chemical plant. I won't go into all of that, but let me say on record that I do not think that the justification can be verified:

Enemies may see opportunities for making mischief. For rogue leaders like Saddam Hussein and North Korea's Kim Jong Il, the Balkans may convey a different message: Now is the best time to take what they want.

Senator MCCAIN talked about this last week, and he did so a few moments ago, also. Last week, he repeated the observation made by the former majority leader, Bob Dole of Kansas, who tearfully told an audience he had been to Kosovo and was shocked in regard to the number that have been killed, the atrocities, and the tragedy that 250,000 people are in the mountains hiding,